

II. Remarks

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5, 11, and 13-29 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 19, and 29 are independent.

The undersigned would like to thank Examiner Harrison for the cordial and productive telephone interview of May 7, 2009. The Examiner's helpful comments and suggestions were instrumental in preparing this response.

Claims 1-5, 11, and 13-29 were rejected as being unpatentable over Wistendahl '136, Sabot, and Toklu, for the reasons noted at pages 2-10 of the Office Action. The undersigned would like to thank Examiner Harrison for the detailed discussion of the art as applied to the claims. Such a discussion is very helpful to Applicants in identifying issues for response. Applicants respectfully traverse all art rejections.

As discussed during the telephone interview, Applicants' claimed invention provides two separate files that are not embedded in the sequence of video frames. The first file is the pixel object file which identifies, by frame number and location within the frame, the selected pixel object in the at least one captured frame and at least one subsequent frame. See, for example the section labeled "Linked Video Files" at

pages 16-19 of the as-filed specification. The second file not embedded in the sequence of video frames is the data object file, which includes data corresponding to the selected pixel object (for example, see the definition of "data object" in the first paragraph of the Detailed Description: "such as a uniform resource locator, fixed overlay information, a streaming video link, database interaction link or other resource platform"). The data object file is separate from the pixel object file.

It is important to not embed the pixel object file and the data object file into the sequence of video frame so that these linked video files may be transported to different playback platforms that may support different compression schemes and different Media Players (see, for example paragraph [0019] of the as-filed specification). It is likewise important to keep the data object file separate from the pixel object file so that data objects (which, in the embodiments, are linked to a product placement database) may be separately categorized, listed, and manipulated (see, for example, paragraphs [0053] - [0056] of the as-filed specification).

In contrast, Wistendahl '136 only stores one file separately from the sequence of video frames - the N Data file. The Frame Data of Wistendahl '136 is the sequence of video frames itself, specifically, the digital data forming the video frames. Wistendahl's N Data file stores "the display location

coordinates of designated 'hot spot' areas in the frames" of the video sequence (paragraph [0032] of Wistendahl). The N Data file also stores "N Data values as anchors for hyperlinks to other files or executable functions ('GO TO...')." (paragraph [0033] of Wistendahl). Accordingly, Wistendahl '136 fails to disclose separate pixel object file and data object file, neither of which is embedded into the sequence of video frames. Therefore, the salient claimed features of the present invention are nowhere disclosed or suggested by the cited art.

In view of the above, it is believed that this application is now in condition for allowance, and a Notice thereof is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 625-3507. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Richard P. Bauer/
Attorney for Applicants
Richard P. Bauer
Registration No. 31,588

PATENT ADMINISTRATOR
KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP
2900 K Street, N.W.
Suite 200
Washington, D.C. 20007-5118